

## REMARKS

Office Action mailed October 5, 2007, the following issues were raised:

1. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite;
2. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,150,409 to Elsner; and
3. Claims 20, 21, 23, 24, and 30-33 (and presumably claims 28 and 29) were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

With respect to the objection to claims 20, 21, 23, 24, and 30-33, none of these claims depend from claim 22, the sole rejected claim in the Office Action. As such, Applicants submit that each of claims 20, 21, 23, 24, and 30-33, along with claims 28 and 29, which depend from claim 20, are in condition suitable for allowance.

Applicants have amended claim 22 to incorporate steps to specifically recite use of the apparatus of claim 20. In view of these amendments, Applicants submit that amended claim 22 now meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Turning to the anticipation rejection, amended claim 22 now incorporates the structure of a security module as part of the series of steps by which a forgery-proof document is produced. Elsner does not teach or disclose these steps or the structure recited in amended claim 22 that is used to carry out the particular steps. As such, Elsner does not anticipate amended claim 22.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections to amended claim 22, along with an indication that claims 20, 21, 23, 24, and 28-33 are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

**CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP**

DATE: January 2, 2008

By: 

David M. Morse  
Reg. No. 50,505

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
The Nemours Building  
1007 North Orange Street  
P.O. Box 2207  
Wilmington, Delaware 19899  
(302) 658-9141  
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)